# REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-5, 8-47, 49-51 and 54-61 were pending. Claims 26-46 and 62-72 are withdrawn. Claims 1, 25, and 47 are currently amended. Claims 73-87 are newly presented.

In view of the Amendments herein and the Remarks that follow, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding rejections, and withdraw them.

## Response to Rejection Under 35 USC § 103(a)

In the 1st and 2nd paragraphs of the Office Action, the Examiner rejects claims 1, 3-5, 8, 11, 16-24, 47, 49-51, 54 and 57 as allegedly begin unpatentable over Tripp et al., US Patent number 6,976,053 ("Tripp") in view of Mathur et al., US Patent Number 6,581,072 ("Mathur").

Claim 1 has been amended to recite:

> generating a user-context-dependent search query based, at least in part, on a user action history comprising **a plurality of dates upon which a plurality of user actions were performed on a plurality of articles**, responsive to identifying an aspect associated with an article;
> generating an insert based, at least in part, on the aspect, wherein the insert comprises a search result associated with the aspect and generated responsive, at least in part, to searching an article index using the user-context-dependant search query; and
> causing the insert to be output in association with the aspect.

In the claimed invention, a user-context-dependent search query based, at least in part, on a user action history comprising a plurality of dates upon which a plurality of user actions were performed on a plurality of articles is generated responsive to identifying an aspect associated with an article. An insert is generated based on the aspect wherein the insert comprises a search result associated with the aspect and generated responsive, at least in part,

to searching an article index using the user-context-dependant search query. The insert is caused to be output in association with the aspect.

Nether Tripp nor Mathur discloses all of these elements, alone or in combination. Specifically, neither Tripp nor Mathur discloses "generating a user-context-dependent search query for a search result associated with the aspect, wherein the user-context-dependent search query is based, at least in part, on a user action history comprising a plurality of dates upon which a plurality of user actions were performed on a plurality of articles".

Tripp is directed to generating and searching an index of files local to a computer. In the Office Action dated November 23, 2007, the Examiner acknowledges that Tripp fails to disclose a user-context-dependent search query based at last in part on a user action history comprising a plurality of user actions.

Therefore, the Examiner relies on Mathur to disclose this element. Mathur is directed to implicitly generating search queries based on browsing documents. The Examiner bases the rejection on a portion of Mathur which states:

> *These search engines use the contents of the document being browsed/viewed by the user as a search query which is communicated from the user computer to the search engine server...Based on the contents of the documents being viewed by the user and based upon index information used by the search engine, the search engine identifies documents of interest to the user.*

(col. 3, lines 60-67). The Examiner states that the quoted portion clearly indicates that the user-context-dependent search query is based on a user action history based on user interactions with a plurality of browsed documents. Applicants submit that this assertion extends this portion of Mathur beyond its teachings. It merely discloses using the contents of **a document** being browsed to generate search queries, not a "plurality of browsed documents".

Assuming, for the sake of argument, that browsing an article corresponds to "a plurality of user actions performed on a plurality of articles". Mathur still fails to disclose using "a user action history comprising a plurality of dates upon which a plurality of user actions were performed on a plurality of articles." Mathur does not teach or disclose using the dates of the browsed documents to generate search queries. Therefore, the combination of Mathur and Tripp fails to disclose this element.

For at least the reasons above, Applicants submit claim 1 would not have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made. Claim 47 recites elements similar to claim 1 and is patentably distinguishable over the cited art for at least the same reasons. Claims 3-5, 8, 11, 16-24 and 49-51 depend from claims 1 and 47 and are likewise patentably distinguishable over the cited art.

In the 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph of the Office Action, the Examiner rejects claims 9-10 and 55-56 as allegedly being unpatentable over Tripp in view of Mathur and further in view of Musgrove et al., U.S. Publication Number 2005/0065909. In the 5<sup>th</sup> paragraph of the Office Action, the Examiner rejects claim 25 as allegedly being unpatentable over Musgrove in view of Mathur. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claims 9-10 and 55-56 depend from claims 1 and 47, respectively, and incorporate the limitations of their base claims. Claim 25 recites similar elements to claims 1 and 47 directed to using "a user action history comprising a plurality of dates upon which a plurality of user actions were performed on a plurality of articles". As discussed above, Tripp and Mathur fail to disclose this element. Musgrove does not remedy this deficiency, nor does the Examiner allege that it does. Accordingly Applicants submit that claims 9-10, 55-56, and 25

are patentably distinguishable over the cited references, whether considered alone or in combination.

In the 4th paragraph of the Office Action, the Examiner rejects claims 12-15 and 58-61 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Tripp in view of Mathur in further view of Phelps (an article entitled "All you can seek"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Phelps does not remedy the deficiencies of Mathur. Phelps merely discusses customization of a web browser based on selection of user options. Phelps does not teach or suggest that a "user-context-dependent search query is based, at least in part, on a user action history comprising a plurality of dates upon which a plurality of user actions were performed on a plurality of articles".

## Conclusion

In sum, Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims, as presented herein, are patentably distinguishable over the cited references. Therefore, Applicants request reconsideration of the basis for the rejections to these claims and request allowance of them. In addition, Applicants respectfully invite Examiner to contact Applicants' representative at the number provided below if Examiner believes it will help expedite furtherance of this application.

Respectfully Submitted,
David B. Auerbach et al.

Date:  February 25, 2008           By:    /Brian Hoffman/

Brian M. Hoffman, Reg. No. 39,713
Attorney for Applicant
Fenwick & West LLP
801 California Street
Mountain View, CA  94041
Tel.:  (415) 875-2484
Fax:  (415) 281-1350